<div align="center">**Remarks**</div>

In response to the final Office Action mailed on December 5, 2006, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 8, 15, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Claims 1-2, 5-11, 15-18, 22-31, 34-37, and 40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable as being anticipated by Parks (U.S. Patent 6,596,031) in view of Dave Winer, "ScriptingNews 2.0b1," http://my.userland.com/stories/storyReader$11, June 15, 1999 (hereinafter "Dave"). Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable as being over Parks in view of Dave and further in view of Anuff et al., (U.S. Patent 6,327,628, hereinafter "Anuff").

<div align="center">**Applicant's Statement of the Substance of the Interview**</div>

A telephonic interview between the undersigned representative for the Applicant and the Examiner was held on December 5, 2006 to discuss the rejection of independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for allegedly containing new matter with respect to the claim feature "…to render a separate news story data file from a subscriber web site which displays a link to a reader selected one of the news stories and without the reader being transferred to a news vendor web site, …" In the interview, the Applicant's representative and the Examiner agreed that support for the aforementioned claim feature is found in paragraph 0028 in the Specification and requested the Applicant to resubmit arguments and remarks directed to this feature in an after final response for further consideration.

<div align="center">**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112**</div>

Claims 1, 8, 15, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for allegedly containing new matter with respect to the claim feature "…to render a separate news story data file from a subscriber web site which displays a link to a reader selected one of the news stories

<div align="center">2</div>

and without the reader being transferred to a news vendor web site, …" This rejection is respectfully traversed. As discussed above in the Applicant's Statement of the Substance of the Interview, support for the aforementioned claim feature may be found in paragraph 0028 of the Specification. Accordingly, the aforementioned claims do not contain new matter and the rejection of claims 1, 8, 15, and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-2, 5-11, 15-18, 22-31, 34-37, and 40-44

Claims 1-2, 5-11, 15-18, 22-31, 34-37, and 40-44 are rejected as being unpatentable over Parks in view of Dave. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 specifies a system for distributing one or more news stories to a reader. The system includes a computer accessible to the reader, the computer having a display device viewable by the reader, a web browser executing on the computer, the web browser having a graphical user interface, a list of titles corresponding to the one or more news stories, the list appearing as a portion of a web page in the graphical user interface, a selection device used by the reader to select one of the news stories to view, and a news story rendering application executing on the computer that uses an RSS file to render a separate news story data file from a subscriber web site which displays a link to a reader selected one of the news stories and without the reader being transferred to a news vendor web site, wherein the news story data file contains a reader selected one of the news stories and resides on the subscriber web site, wherein the RSS file contains a directory listing which identifies a name of a rendering file used by the news story rendering application to locate the selected news story, wherein the name of the rendering file is the same as a name of the news story data file, wherein the rendering file instructs the web browser how to display data in the graphical user interface, and wherein the

3

news story data file is rendered so that it is viewable in the graphical user interface in accordance with the instructions in the news story rendering file and the data in the news story data file.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Parks and Dave fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended independent claim 1. For example, the combination of the cited references fails to disclose that the RSS (Rich Site Summary) file is used to render a separate news story data file from a subscriber web site which displays a link to a reader selected one of the news stories and without the reader being transferred to a news vendor web site, wherein the news story data file contains a reader selected one of the news stories and resides on the subscriber web site, wherein the RSS file contains a directory listing which identifies a name of a rendering file used by the news story rendering application to locate the selected news story, and wherein the name of the rendering file is the same as a name of the news story data file.

As discussed in the Applicants' previous response, Parks merely discloses a "parser" used for verifying a news document in NMSL format by replacing omitted tags or by filling in tags with default values (see Fig. 2B and col. 8, lines 1-65). Parks is silent with respect to an RSS file (the Office Action concedes Parks fails to disclose an RSS file) used to render a separate news story data file from a subscriber web site which displays a link to a reader selected news story (Parks only refers to news story documents being stored on a file storage that may reside on a server or client system – see col. 7, lines 6-9), a news story data file which resides on the subscriber web site, an RSS file containing a directory listing which identifies a name of a rendering file used by a news story rendering application to locate a selected news story, and a rendering file having the same name as a news story data file (see Figs. 2A-D; col. 6, line 57 through col. 8, line 65; and col. 19, lines 4-5).

4

Dave fails to cure the deficiencies of Parks in that the reference merely discloses the limitations of the RSS file format for use by news vendor web sites (see pages 1-3). Furthermore, Dave fails to teach, disclose, or suggest rendering a separate news story data file from a subscriber web site which displays a link to a reader selected one of the news stories and without the reader being transferred to a news vendor web site. As is known to those skilled in the art, the conventional RSS file format merely provides links to news (i.e., vendor) sites. Upon a user selecting a link, the user or reader is transferred to the vendor's web site to access the information identified by the link. Dave validates this conventional usage on page 3 (see paragraph starting with "Differences between <scriptingNews> and RSS") where a web address is discussed with respect to linking to multiple pages. Conversely, independent claim 1 specifies a news story data file resides on a subscriber web site (the site displaying a link to the news story) and the news story is rendered to the reader in a browser without the reader being transferred to the vendor or news web site. Moreover, since Dave seems to merely reference the conventional RSS format, it should also be pointed out that the conventional version of this format also fails to support directory listings which identify a name of a rendering file used by a news story rendering application to locate a selected news story or that the name of the rendering file is the same as a name of a news story data file.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Parks and Dave fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in independent claim 1. Therefore, amended independent claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 2 and 5-7 depend from independent claim 1, specify at least the same features, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Independent claims 8, 15, 22, 29, 35, and 42 recite similar features as independent claim 1 and are thus also allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 9-11, 16-

18, 23-26, 30-31, 34, 36-37, 40-41, and 43-44 depend from independent claims 8, 15, 22, 29, 35, and 42 respectively, and are thus also allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of claims 9-11, 16-18, 23-26, 30-31, 34, 36-37, 40-41, and 43-44 should also be withdrawn.

<div align="center">Claim 12</div>

Claim 12 is rejected as being unpatentable over Parks in view of Dave and further in view of Anuff. The rejection of this claim is respectfully traversed.

Claim 12 depends from independent claim 8 and thus specifies at least the same features. As discussed above, the combination of Parks and Dave fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in independent claim 8. Anuff, relied upon in the Office Action for allegedly curing the deficiencies of Parks and Dave, discusses a portal server for providing services through a library of object-oriented classes, such as classes in the Java programming language, that give access to various databases, web servers, scripting environments and mail services. Anuff also discusses a news module for displaying various categories of news and news headlines. The module may generate a "front" page display for the news headlines and an edit page display which displays a list of available news categories and previous news categories selected by a user. The module may provide the two displays by having a separate "view" object in charge of each type of display. See col. 1, lines 59-67 and col. 13, lines 58-65. Anuff however, fails to disclose that an RSS (Rich Site Summary) file is used to render a separate news story data file from a subscriber web site which displays a link to a reader selected one of the news stories and without the reader being transferred to a news vendor web site, wherein the news story data file contains a reader selected one of the news stories and resides on the subscriber web site, wherein the RSS file contains a directory listing which identifies a name of a

rendering file used by the news story rendering application to locate the selected news story, and wherein the name of the rendering file is the same as a name of the news story data file, as specified in claim 12. Therefore, claim 12 is allowable for at least the foregoing reasons and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 5, 2007

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III, Reg. #47299

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355
(678) 565-4748